



Globally consistent influences of seasonal precipitation limit grassland biomass response to elevated CO₂

Hovenden, Mark J.; Leuzinger, Sebastian; Newton, Paul C. D.; Fletcher, Andrew; Fatichi, Simone; Luscher, Andreas; Reich, Peter B.; Andresen, Louise C.; Beier, Claus; Blumenthal, Dana M.; Chiariello, Nona R.; Dukes, Jeffrey S.; Kellner, Juliane; Hofmockel, Kirsten; Niklaus, Pascal A.; Song, Jian; Wan, Shiqiang; Classen, Aimee T.; Langley, J. Adam

Published in:
Nature Plants

DOI:
[10.1038/s41477-018-0356-x](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41477-018-0356-x)

Publication date:
2019

Document version
Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (APA):
Hovenden, M. J., Leuzinger, S., Newton, P. C. D., Fletcher, A., Fatichi, S., Luscher, A., Reich, P. B., Andresen, L. C., Beier, C., Blumenthal, D. M., Chiariello, N. R., Dukes, J. S., Kellner, J., Hofmockel, K., Niklaus, P. A., Song, J., Wan, S., Classen, A. T., & Langley, J. A. (2019). Globally consistent influences of seasonal precipitation limit grassland biomass response to elevated CO₂. *Nature Plants*, 5(2), 167-173.
<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41477-018-0356-x>

**Globally consistent influences of seasonal precipitation limit grassland
biomass response to CO₂**

Authors

Mark J. Hovenden^{1*}, Sebastian Leuzinger², Paul C. D. Newton³, Andrew Fletcher², Simone
Fatichi⁴, Andreas Lüscher^{5,6}, Peter B. Reich^{7,8}, Louise C. Andresen^{9,10}, Claus Beier¹¹, Dana
M. Blumenthal¹², Nona R. Chiariello¹³, Jeffrey S. Dukes¹⁴, Juliane Kellner⁹, Kirsten
Hofmockel^{15,16}, Pascal A. Niklaus¹⁷, Jian Song¹⁸, Shiqiang Wan¹⁸, Aimée T. Classen¹⁹, J.
Adam Langley²⁰

Affiliations

¹Biological Sciences, School of Natural Sciences, University of Tasmania, Hobart, Tasmania,
Australia.

²Institute for Applied Ecology New Zealand, Auckland University of Technology, Auckland
New Zealand

³Plant Functional Biology, AgResearch, Palmerston North, New Zealand

⁴Institute of Environmental Engineering, ETH Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland

⁵ETH Zürich, Institute of Agricultural Sciences, Zürich, Switzerland

⁶Agroscope, Forage Production and Grassland Systems, Zürich, Switzerland

⁷Department of Forest Resources, University of Minnesota, St Paul, Minnesota, USA

⁸Hawkesbury Institute for the Environment, Western Sydney University, Penrith, New South
Wales 2751, Australia

22 ⁹Department of Plant Ecology, Justus Liebig University of Giessen, Giessen, Germany

23 ¹⁰Department of Earth Sciences, University of Gothenburg, Sweden

24 ¹¹Department of Geosciences and Natural Resource Management, University of Copenhagen,
25 Frederiksberg, Denmark

26 ¹²Rangeland Resources Research Unit, USDA Agricultural Research Service, Fort Collins,
27 CO, USA

28 ¹³Jasper Ridge Biological Preserve, Stanford University, Woodside, CA, USA.

29 ¹⁴Purdue Climate Change Research Center, Department of Forestry and Natural Resources,
30 and Department of Biological Sciences, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN, USA

31 ¹⁵Department of Ecology, Evolution and Organismal Biology, Iowa State University, Ames,
32 IA, USA

33 ¹⁶Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, Washington, USA

34 ¹⁷Department of Evolutionary Biology and Environmental Studies, University of Zurich,
35 Zurich, Switzerland

36 ¹⁸International Joint Research Laboratory for Global Change Ecology, School of Life
37 Sciences, Henan University, Kaifeng, Henan, China

38 ¹⁹Rubenstein School of Environment and Natural Resources, University of Vermont, Burlington,
39 VT 05405, USA

40 ²⁰Department of Biology, Villanova University, Villanova, PA, USA

41 * Author for correspondence. Mark.Hovenden@utas.edu.au

42

43 **Abstract**

44 Rising atmospheric carbon dioxide concentration ($[\text{CO}_2]$) should stimulate biomass
45 production directly via biochemical stimulation of carbon assimilation and indirectly via
46 water savings caused by increased plant water use efficiency¹. Because of these water
47 savings², the CO_2 fertilisation effect should be stronger in drier sites³, yet large differences
48 among experiments in grassland biomass response to elevated CO_2 appear unrelated to annual
49 precipitation^{2,4}, preventing useful generalisations. Here we show that, as predicted, the impact
50 of elevated CO_2 on biomass production in 19 globally-distributed temperate grassland
51 experiments reduces as mean precipitation in seasons other than spring increases but,
52 unexpectedly, rises as mean spring precipitation increases. Moreover, because sites with high
53 spring precipitation also tend to have high precipitation at other times, these effects of spring
54 and non-spring precipitation on the CO_2 response offset each other, constraining the response
55 of ecosystem productivity to rising CO_2 . This explains why previous analyses were unable to
56 discern a reliable trend between site dryness and the CO_2 fertilisation effect^{2,4}. Thus, the CO_2
57 fertilisation effect in temperate grasslands worldwide will be constrained by their natural
58 rainfall seasonality such that the stimulation of biomass by rising CO_2 could be substantially
59 less than anticipated.

60 **Introduction**

61 The capacity of the biosphere to absorb carbon as the atmospheric concentration of CO₂
62 ([CO₂]) increases is a crucial yet uncertain factor in climate science ⁵. The fundamental
63 physiology is simple; photosynthesis of most plants is not saturated at current [CO₂], so
64 increasing [CO₂] should stimulate biomass production ¹. Additionally, increasing [CO₂]
65 reduces stomatal aperture, increasing plant water-use efficiency and, by maintaining higher
66 soil moisture storage, increasing productivity in water-limited ecosystems ¹. Together with
67 other minor indirect effects, these two mechanisms produce the CO₂ fertilisation effect on
68 biomass (CFE), defined as the elevated CO₂ (eCO₂)-driven increase in biomass production as
69 percentage of that in control plots. However, models currently ‘disagree strongly’ ⁶ on the
70 size of the positive CO₂ –productivity feedback indicating that the processes driving eCO₂
71 responses are not well characterised, leading to argument as to the strength of the CFE ^{7,8}.
72 The CFE measured in experiments that manipulate [CO₂] varies substantially among studies
73 ^{2,9} and is considerably lower in open-air experiments than expected from leaf-level and
74 enclosure studies, even for crop plants ¹⁰. Various factors have been proposed to influence the
75 magnitude of the CFE ^{2,4,9-11}, but none have explained the large variation observed among
76 experiments. Grasslands occupy over 29% of ice-free land and are consequently important
77 components of the global carbon budget, so the large degree of unexplained variation (~300%
78 CV¹¹) in grassland biomass response to eCO₂ limits our ability to estimate future carbon
79 cycling.

80 Indirect effects caused by changes in plant water-use efficiency can have a pivotal, and
81 sometimes dominant, influence on the overall biomass response to eCO₂ ^{1,3,4}. These indirect
82 effects likely relate to precipitation patterns and soil moisture conditions ¹² and might explain
83 why CFE responds strongly to precipitation at particular sites and why the mean CFE varies
84 even among similar sites. Despite having a firm theoretical basis, attempts to use water

availability to explain CFE have yielded little success^{2,9,11}, and individual studies have countered the theory^{13,14} suggesting the opposite, that water scarcity can partially limit CFE. We propose that these apparent contradictions are caused by precipitation having different effects on the CFE at different times of year¹⁵. Previous work has demonstrated that the seasonal balance of rainfall predicts the CFE at a single site¹⁵, so we suspected that a similar influence might extend across sites. Here, we test the hypothesis that differences in mean CFE among sites are related to site differences in the seasonal precipitation totals.

Experimental results

Using data from 19 grassland CO₂-manipulation experiments and a total of 163 experimental years (Table S1), we show that the differences among experiments in mean CFE are explained extremely well by a stimulatory effect of precipitation in spring and a suppressive effect of precipitation at other times of the year (Fig. 1). The experiments were distributed throughout temperate zones in North America, Europe, Asia and Australasia, covering a wide range of grassland types and environmental factors (Table S1). The mean CFE of these experiments was $9.0 \pm 1.7\%$ (mean \pm SEM) at an average enrichment level of 243 $\mu\text{mol CO}_2 \text{ mol}^{-1}$ and an average ambient [CO₂] of 375 $\mu\text{mol mol}^{-1}$, but variation in CFE among experiments was large, with site-mean CFE ranging from -7.1% to +20.0% (Table S1). We used simple and multiple regression analyses to determine whether variation in mean CFE among sites was related to climatic and site factors. We tested the impact on CFE of mean annual, autumn, winter, spring and summer precipitation over the study period at each site, with the seasons defined as being three calendar months in duration with 1 March being the first day of spring in the Northern Hemisphere and autumn in the Southern Hemisphere. We also tested the effects on the mean CFE of mean annual temperature, mean shoot nitrogen content, mean soil C to N ratio, mean annual aboveground biomass production, the proportion of C₄ plants at each site, the CO₂ enrichment level and the fumigation technique

(chambers versus FACE technology). Importantly, variation among experiments in the mean CFE was not explained by any of the tested site variables (Fig. 2), but 74.7% of the variation in CFE among sites was explained by a two-factor model that incorporated mean spring precipitation and the mean summed precipitation at other times of the year (i.e. “non-spring precipitation”, $r^2=0.747$, $F_{2,16}=23.6$, $P<0.00002$; Table S2). Site-mean CFE was enhanced by decreasing non-spring precipitation ($P=0.0002$; Fig. 1), but the effect of low precipitation in spring was negative, i.e. the opposite pattern ($P<0.00001$; Fig. 1). Thus, the mean CFE for a site was determined by the combination of the stimulatory effect of higher spring precipitation and the stimulatory effect of lower non-spring precipitation (Fig. 1). Considering the range of spring and non-spring precipitation values, the influence of spring and non-spring precipitation on the CFE are relatively evenly balanced, such that their impacts tend to be similar in scale but opposite in influence.

Data from both the experimental sites and a worldwide precipitation grid covering temperate grassland show that sites that are wetter in spring also tend to be wetter during the rest of the year (Fig. 3, Fig. S1) and hence the contrasting impact of precipitation in spring and non-spring periods constrains the CFE (Fig. 3). This offsetting influence of average spring versus average non-spring precipitation on the CFE explains why mean annual precipitation by itself is a very poor predictor of the CFE (Fig. 2; $r^2=0.02$, $P=0.68$) and why earlier analyses failed to discern any substantial effect of overall site wetness or dryness (usually described by annual metrics) on the degree of stimulation of biomass across sites with markedly different aridity levels. Importantly, none of the other potential predictor variables significantly improved the predictive capacity of the two-factor model (Tables S2-S4) nor were they strongly correlated with the two predictors (Fig. S2), indicating that the observed relationship is unlikely to be mediated by these factors. This offsetting mechanism also explains why the CFE observed in field experiments is mostly lower than anticipated.

135 Certain site characteristics such as the proportion of C₄ species in a community^{16,17} and N
136 availability^{18,19} can influence the CFE within a site, but our analysis indicates that these
137 ecosystem traits, as well as factors such as mean annual temperature and the degree of CO₂
138 enrichment, had little influence on the differences in CFE among grassland experiments.
139 Further, fumigation technique (chambered versus FACE experiments) had no significant
140 impact on the CFE (Fig. S3). We suggest that the amount and seasonal distribution of
141 precipitation shape important, relatively stable community and ecosystem properties at a
142 particular site, determining the site's average or 'inherent' CFE. We believe such properties
143 to be the result of long-term (multi-year and evolutionary) processes and their effect on the
144 biomass CO₂ response differ fundamentally from that of shorter-term physiological
145 mechanisms.

146 First, a site that tends to have wet springs will have communities biologically equipped to
147 take advantage of eCO₂. Repeatedly, experiments show grasslands are more responsive to
148 changes in spring precipitation than to changes at other times of year^{20,21}, so that spring
149 precipitation is the best predictor of grassland productivity²² and has a disproportionate
150 influence on community properties key to ecosystem function²³. Thus, the strong impact of
151 spring precipitation on the CFE is most likely mediated via positive relationships with plant
152 species richness^{17,24,25}, leaf-area-index, meristem density²⁶, microbial community function²⁷
153 and ecosystem resource availability, all of which boost the CFE. Additionally, the strong
154 effect of spring precipitation is robust to variation in the definition of spring by about 20 days
155 (Fig. S4). The *a priori* definition of spring we used here (i.e. "calendar spring" 1 March-31
156 May in the Northern Hemisphere, 1 September – 30 November in the Southern Hemisphere)
157 is at the early edge of that range, indicating the importance of including late-spring
158 precipitation for explaining variation in CFE. This agrees with the fact that altering our
159 definition of spring by advancing the commencement date by only 10 days dramatically

reduced our ability to explain the variation in CFE among sites, whereas delaying the commencement of spring by up to 20 days had little effect on the predictive power of spring precipitation (Fig. S4). Such a strong effect of advancing the definition of spring onset by only 10 days is surprising since the season was defined to span three months, but it indicates the importance of capturing the amount of precipitation that falls within the entirety of the spring period. This suggests that the amount of precipitation that falls while the grassland is in its maximum growth period affects key properties of the community and/or ecosystem, as suggested elsewhere²⁰⁻²³. We also tested the effect of site-specific “growing-season” precipitation (Table S1) using both broad and narrow definitions of the growing season (see Methods for details) but this analysis explained far less of the variation in CFE among sites than the spring/non-spring analysis. This is because definitions of growing seasons often extend far into the summer period, combining periods in which precipitation has opposing effects on the CFE (Fig. 1). In addition, we tested the effect of varying the duration of spring between one month and six months, but again, none of the models approached the ability of the spring/non-spring model to describe the variation in CFE. Thus, while the exact timing of the onset of warmer conditions conducive to active growth will vary from site to site and year to year, the traditional definition of the three-month spring period clearly captures the impact of precipitation on important ecosystem properties that have real and measurable effects on productivity.

Second, a considerable proportion of the CFE is obtained from the anti-transpirant effects of eCO₂, which are most pronounced in drier sites^{1,3,4}. Therefore, a site that tends to be wet in seasons other than spring has limited opportunities for the benefits of the water-saving effects of eCO₂ to be realised simply because the soil in such sites will tend to be moist even when not exposed to eCO₂. Thus, the CFE reduces as non-spring precipitation increases, exactly as predicted from theory^{1,3,4}. The combination of these two factors determines the site’s inherent

185 ability to respond to eCO₂. Importantly, it is a site's mean precipitation in the spring and non-
186 spring periods that determines the mean strength of the CFE. Long-term precipitation
187 averages have a far greater impact on crucial community and ecosystem properties such as
188 plant community composition than shorter-term deviations from the average ²⁸, indicating
189 that ecosystem properties link the mean CFE with precipitation, rather than the immediate
190 effects of precipitation on carbon assimilation rates. Thus, increasing spring precipitation
191 increases a site's tendency to possess community traits that boost the response to eCO₂.
192 Unravelling the mechanisms whereby this occurs should now become a key goal of global
193 change ecology and will require concerted, global observational and experimental efforts.
194 The fact that the models with the greatest ability to explain the variation among sites were
195 those that included the entirety of the spring period suggests that processes occurring
196 belowground prior to shoot emergence and those occurring during the early stages of biomass
197 formation are key to understanding the mean CFE response of a system.

198 In short, we found that it is the *tendency* of a site to receive more or less precipitation than
199 another site in spring or in the rest of the year, as indicated by the average values, that
200 influences the site's mean CFE, rather than a direct link between each precipitation event and
201 CO₂-related growth stimulation. This is supported by the fact that interannual variation in
202 CFE within each site was poorly described by the combination of spring and non-spring
203 precipitation (Fig. S5). Within each site, the annual CFE can be affected by a variety of
204 factors, including deviation from the climatic average as well as lags and legacies of
205 responses to treatments in previous years. For instance, a strong stimulation of biomass
206 production in one year could deplete soil nutrient stocks, leading to suppressed responses in
207 subsequent years ²⁹. Similarly, conditions that limit growth in one year could lead to the
208 accumulation of nutrients and lead to strong growth responses in subsequent years. In both of
209 these scenarios, the annual CFE values will be divorced from the contemporaneous

precipitation since the CFE will be partly dependent upon the climatic conditions of antecedent years, such as occurs with other ecosystem processes³⁰⁻³³. However, over longer periods the site average CFE should tend towards the inherent CFE for that location, which is determined by the combination of average values of spring and non-spring precipitation.

Geographical extrapolation

The ability to describe variation in CFE among grassland sites allows us to project the potential CFE of a site from easily obtained climatic variables (Fig. 3), as is possible for ANPP^{34,35}. By doing this for temperate grasslands worldwide, we found that most grasslands occur in sites in which the combination of spring and non-spring precipitation leads to a low CFE (Fig. 3). Although there is substantial geographic variation in the potential CFE of temperate grasslands, the projected CFE is below 10% in large areas across all continents (Fig. 4), constrained by the seasonality of precipitation in those locations (Fig. 3). The average expected CFE of temperate grasslands from our projections is $6.0 \pm 0.03\%$, one-third lower than that observed in the experiments (Fig. 1) because of the global prevalence of temperate grasslands in sites with low spring precipitation but moderate precipitation at other times of year (Fig. 3). Thus, predicting eCO₂ effects on grassland biomass production by averaging experimental results without the geographical extrapolation would lead to overestimation of the CFE.

Conclusions

Clearly, predicting carbon feedbacks to the atmosphere is a global research priority³⁶ and the CFE is a dominant uncertainty in projecting biosphere feedback effects on the growth of atmospheric [CO₂]. We show consistent, biome-wide, interactions of the CFE with precipitation seasonality that suggest the CFE in grasslands is likely to be less than would be predicted by models that do not accurately represent these counteracting influences of

234 precipitation at different times of year ⁶. Targeted experiments in underrepresented grassland
235 areas, especially the neglected tropical areas and those predicted to have low CFE, would be
236 an efficient way of refining and confirming our capacity to project the impact of eCO₂ on
237 grasslands around the world. Together with a thorough examination of belowground biomass
238 responses to eCO₂ and how biomass responses translate into ecosystem carbon balance, this
239 will be the next important step in improving global predictions of carbon feedbacks from
240 terrestrial ecosystems.
241

242 **Methods**

243 We collected annual aboveground biomass data from the 19 experiments listed in Table S1,
244 all of which were either open-top chamber (OTC) or Free Air CO₂ Enrichment (FACE)
245 experiments located outdoors with plants growing in the soil (i.e. not in pots). We used all
246 experiments for which annual aboveground biomass data were available either directly from
247 the researchers or from published results. Where experiments included factors other than CO₂
248 manipulation, such as warming or precipitation removal, we only used the control (ambient)
249 levels of the other factors and therefore examined the CO₂ response independent of other
250 experimental factors, essentially treating each experiment as a single-factor experiment. The
251 SwissFACE experiment included differing levels of nutrient application as a treatment. We
252 used data from the lower level of nutrient application, which was merely sufficient to replace
253 the nutrients removed during regular biomass harvests. We first calculated the annual CO₂
254 fertilisation effect (CFE) as the difference in annual aboveground biomass production
255 between elevated CO₂ and control plots, expressed as a percentage of biomass of control
256 plots. The difference in biomass between elevated and control plots was corrected for any
257 pre-existing difference where these data were available. Most experiments harvested or
258 measured aboveground biomass once per year but where biomass was harvested more
259 frequently, the individual harvest values were summed at the plot level to obtain the annual
260 aboveground biomass values.

261 Daily precipitation was obtained from each site individually using data collected on site with
262 automatic weather stations (most sites) or from a nearby meteorological weather station
263 (Kansas and Hungary). In both instances, the weather station was within ~2.5 km of the
264 experimental site. At the Swiss FACE site, the locally-collected precipitation data contained
265 short gaps in the record, amounting to ~5% of the total record, so we used data from the
266 nearest meteorological weather station to interpolate the missing values. We used the daily

precipitation data to calculate seasonal precipitation totals for each year at each site. The seasons were defined to commence on 1 March (spring in the northern hemisphere, autumn in the southern), 1 June (summer in the northern hemisphere, winter in the southern), 1 September (autumn in the northern hemisphere, spring in the southern) and 1 December (winter in the northern hemisphere, summer in the southern). The seasonal precipitation total was defined as the sum of daily precipitation over the season in each year and this value was then averaged over all years for which the experiment ran. Annual precipitation was defined as the sum of autumn, winter, spring and summer precipitation totals, with the year commencing on 1 September in the Northern Hemisphere and 1 March in the Southern Hemisphere. The year was defined this way so that it was the year preceding the biomass harvest, which normally occurred in late summer or very early autumn. The seasonal and annual precipitation totals were calculated in the same manner for all experiments.

Characteristics of each experiment to be used as potential drivers of the CFE were supplied by the experimental team from each site or obtained from published values for each experiment. Mean CO₂ enrichment was obtained from annual enrichment values, using annual CO₂ values for elevated and ambient/control plots, then averaged for each site over all years of each experiment. Mean site aboveground biomass production was calculated as the annual aboveground biomass produced in ambient/control plots of each experiment, averaged over all years of the experiment. The proportion of C₄ plants at each site was calculated as the aboveground biomass contribution of C₄ plants as a proportion of total aboveground biomass in control plots in each experiment, averaged over all years of the experiment. Mean shoot N was calculated as the mean percent N of aboveground biomass in control plots for each experiment, again averaged over all years for which data were available. Site fertility was also calculated as total soil nitrogen content and soil carbon to nitrogen ratio, but each of these variables had a discontinuous distribution and were thought not to be the most reliable

predictors of fertility given that some of the sites were located on organic-rich soils. Nonetheless, all three of these fertility indicators were used in turn in the below analyses, with negligible effects on the analysis outcome, thus shoot N was selected for final analyses. Relationships between the CFE and potential drivers were determined by multiple regression analyses using R³⁷. Beginning with all possible combinations of the five precipitation metrics (annual, autumn, winter, spring and summer precipitation totals) and the other six potential drivers (mean annual temperature, mean shoot N, mean annual aboveground biomass production, proportion C₄, mean CO₂ enrichment and fumigation technique), we ranked the resultant models using the Akaike Information Criterion corrected for finite sample size (AIC_c), using the MuMIN package of R³⁸. Model competitiveness was determined by observation of the difference in AIC_c between each model and the lowest value of AIC_c obtained (Δ AIC_c). Models were ranked in ascending Δ AIC_c value and a distinction between competitive and non-competitive models was made by observing any obvious breaks in the sequence of ascending Δ AIC_c. A single two-factor model containing annual and spring precipitation totals was clearly superior to other models and had a 15% probability of being the best model among all possible models, with next most competitive model only having a 7% probability of being the best model (Table S2), so no coefficient averaging was necessary. This model had an r^2 value of 0.75 ($P < 0.00002$) but because spring and annual precipitation were significantly correlated ($r^2 = 0.88$), we replaced the annual precipitation term with non-spring precipitation (i.e. the total precipitation in seasons other than spring), which was less strongly correlated with spring precipitation ($r^2 = 0.78$). We also calculated the variance inflation factor (VIF) as an additional test of collinearity and the VIF was 2.6 for the spring + non-spring precipitation model, approximately half the value for the spring + annual precipitation model (VIF=4.5), indicating the model incorporating non-spring precipitation had a substantially lower impact from collinearity, and far below 5, the VIF value generally

believed to cause concern³⁹. However, collinearity can influence interpretation of a multiple regression relationship and affect predictions using a model containing collinear predictor variables. Therefore, we first tested whether the strength of the regression was influenced by the incorporation of both spring and non-spring precipitation by regressing non-spring precipitation against spring precipitation, calculating the residuals between the non-spring values and the regression line and using these residual values in the model instead, following the method of Harrell⁴⁰. This has the advantage of retaining the information contained in the predictor variable, but removing any collinearity between it (non-spring precipitation) and the remaining term (spring precipitation; $r^2 < 0.01$). This model had an identical r^2 value (0.747, $P < 0.00002$) to that of the original model containing spring and non-spring precipitation, indicating that the original model is robust and, importantly, its interpretation not subject to error from collinearity. Second, collinearity can inflate the errors involved in making predictions but only if predictions involve predictor variables that are not similarly correlated⁴⁰. Thus, predictions using the model containing spring and non-spring precipitation would be unreliable if spring and non-spring precipitation were not correlated in the dataset used for predictions. Therefore, we tested the relationship between spring and non-spring precipitation using the entire gridded dataset of mean spring and non-spring precipitation for all temperate grasslands globally (Fig. S1). The relationship between spring and non-spring precipitation was almost identical in the global temperate grassland dataset (regression coefficient = 0.27 ± 0.1) as in the dataset used to construct the model (regression coefficient = 0.28 ± 0.05). Since collinearity does not affect predictions made using new data that have the same degree of collinearity as the original data⁴⁰, we are confident that the predictions using this model are robust and appropriate.

Therefore, we examined the influence of spring and non-spring precipitation on the CFE by multiple linear regression, also testing for an interaction between spring and non-spring

precipitation on the CFE, which was found to be non-significant ($P=0.24$). Further, we tested the relationship between mean CFE and all combinations between spring and non-spring precipitation and the other six potential, non-precipitation predictors (mean annual temperature, mean shoot N, proportion C_4 , mean CO_2 enrichment and fumigation technique, Table S3) using the same methods as above. Finally, we used a hierarchical approach, adding each of the non-precipitation predictors in turn to the two-factor model and testing whether this led to a significant improvement in model performance using analysis of variance (Table S4). We also tested the performance of the seven-term model containing all of these predictors (Table S4). None of the resultant three-factor models significantly improved model performance and neither did the seven-term model (Table S4), thus the most parsimonious model under all tests remained the two-factor model. Partial regression analysis was used to determine the effects, with 95% confidence limits, of spring and non-spring precipitation totals on the mean site CFE using the *effects* package in R⁴¹.

Additionally, we tested the impact of precipitation in and out of the growing season, as opposed to in and out of spring, using a two-factor model and growing season dates estimated for each site individually. We used both broad and narrow definitions of growing season as either the period encompassing non-trivial aboveground growth (broad) or the period of maximum aboveground biomass production (narrow). The variation among sites in mean CFE was very poorly explained by the combination of growing season and non-growing season precipitation, whether the broad ($r^2=0.06$, $F_{2,16}=0.5$, $P=0.6$) or narrow ($r^2=0.08$, $F_{2,16}=0.7$, $P=0.5$) definition of growing season was used. Further, neither growing season (broad definition, $r^2=0.04$, $F_{1,17}=0.7$, $P=0.4$; narrow definition, $r^2=0.05$, $F_{1,17}=0.8$, $P=0.4$), nor non-growing season precipitation (broad definition, $r^2=0.02$, $F_{1,17}=0.4$, $P=0.5$; narrow definition, $r^2=0.04$, $F_{1,17}=0.7$, $P=0.4$) were correlated with annual CFE of a site, nor was the proportion of precipitation received during the growing season (broad definition, $r^2=0.003$,

367 $F_{1,17}=0.05$, $P=0.8$; narrow definition, $r^2=0.04$, $F_{1,17}=0.07$, $P=0.8$). Hence, variation in the CFE
368 among sites was not related to growing season precipitation.

369 We tested the impact of varying the definition of spring by either advancing or delaying the
370 commencement date from 1 March/September by 10, 20, 30 or 45 days and testing the impact
371 this alteration had on the performance of the two-factor spring/non-spring model. The
372 duration of the spring period was maintained at 90 days for all comparisons. Since
373 precipitation data were only available as monthly values for 3 of the 19 experiments, the
374 spring adjustment analysis was done using the remaining 16 of the sites. Advancing the
375 definition of spring substantially reduced the two-factor model's ability to explain variation
376 among sites in mean CFE (Fig. S4). In contrast, delaying the definition of spring by up to 20
377 days had little impact on model performance but longer delays caused it to decline (Fig. S4).
378 Therefore, we maintained our definition of spring as commencing on 1 March (Northern
379 Hemisphere) or 1 September (Southern Hemisphere).

380 Data conformed to the assumptions of the statistical tests involved, as tested by investigation
381 of residuals, leverage and normality as well as using Box-Cox plots using the MASS package
382 in R ⁴². The only exception was mean annual biomass production of control plots, in which
383 the single datapoint from the site in Ireland exerted excessive leverage on the relationship
384 with CFE. Therefore, this single datapoint was removed from subsequent analyses.

385 We conducted mapping and spatial analyses in ArcMap 10.3 and ESRI, USA. The 8 km
386 AVHRR global land cover classification ⁴³ product provided moderate oversampling of land
387 cover classification for wooded grasslands, grasslands and croplands that we determined to
388 be representative of the model target. We added land cover class, spring and non-spring
389 precipitation to CFE modelled values using the *Sample* and *Spatial Join* (nearest geodesic)
390 tools respectively. Spring and non-spring precipitation values were calculated from a 10' grid
391 of monthly precipitation values obtained from the Climatic Research Unit at the University of

East Anglia CRU CL v. 2.0 database, which is available (<http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/data>) under the Open Database License (ODbL). These values were used to calculate the local CFE from the spring + non-spring multiple regression model. We mapped all CFE values for locations meeting model parameters for climate zone and land cover. We visualised the limits of model precipitation parameters by interpolating total precipitation data (*Ordinary Kriging*) and classifying the resulting raster with masks applied to tropic and polar zones. Calculations using the geographically projected values of CFE only included those sites that fell within the range of spring and non-spring precipitation values observed in the experimental sites.

Reporting summary. Further information on research design is available in the Nature Research Reporting Summary linked to this article.

Data availability

All data generated or analysed during this study are included in this published article (and its supplementary information files) with the exception of the gridded GIS data, which are available from <https://crudata.uea.ac.uk/cru/data/hrg/tmc/> for the precipitation data and from <http://glcf.umd.edu/data/landcover/data.shtml> for the landcover data.

- 409 1 Drake, B. G., Gonzalez-Meler, M. A. & Long, S. P. More efficient plants: a
410 consequence of rising atmospheric CO₂? *Annu. Rev. Plant Physiol. Plant Mol. Biol.*
411 **48**, 609-639 (1997).
- 412 2 Morgan, J. A. *et al.* Water relations in grassland and desert ecosystems exposed to
413 elevated atmospheric CO₂. *Oecologia* **140**, 11-25 (2004).
- 414 3 Fatichi, S. *et al.* Partitioning direct and indirect effects reveals the response of water-
415 limited ecosystems to elevated CO₂. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **113**, 12757-12762,
416 doi:10.1073/pnas.1605036113 (2016).
- 417 4 Lee, M., Manning, P., Rist, J., Power, S. A. & Marsh, C. A global comparison of
418 grassland biomass responses to CO₂ and nitrogen enrichment. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc.*
419 *Lond., Ser. B: Biol. Sci.* **365**, 2047-2056, doi:10.1098/rstb.2010.0028 (2010).
- 420 5 Schimel, D., Stephens, B. B. & Fisher, J. B. Effect of increasing CO₂ on the terrestrial
421 carbon cycle. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **112**, 436-441, doi:10.1073/pnas.1407302112
422 (2015).
- 423 6 Medlyn, B. E. *et al.* Using ecosystem experiments to improve vegetation models.
424 *Nature Clim. Change* **5**, 528-534, doi:10.1038/nclimate2621 (2015).
- 425 7 Kolby Smith, W. *et al.* Large divergence of satellite and Earth system model estimates
426 of global terrestrial CO₂ fertilization. *Nature Clim. Change* **6**, 306-310,
427 doi:10.1038/nclimate2879 (2016).
- 428 8 De Kauwe, M. G., Keenan, T. F., Medlyn, B. E., Prentice, I. C. & Terrer, C. Satellite
429 based estimates underestimate the effect of CO₂ fertilization on net primary
430 productivity. *Nature Clim. Change* **6**, 892-893, doi:10.1038/nclimate3105 (2016).
- 431 9 Fay, P. A. *et al.* Dominant plant taxa predict plant productivity responses to CO₂
432 enrichment across precipitation and soil gradients. *AoB Plants* **7**,
433 doi:10.1093/aobpla/plv027 (2015).
- 434 10 Ainsworth, E. A. & Long, S. P. What have we learned from 15 years of free-air CO₂
435 enrichment (FACE)? A meta-analytic review of the responses of photosynthesis,
436 canopy properties and plant production to rising CO₂. *New Phytol.* **165**, 351-372
437 (2005).
- 438 11 Terrer, C., Vicca, S., Hungate, B. A., Phillips, R. P. & Prentice, I. C. Mycorrhizal
439 association as a primary control of the CO₂ fertilization effect. *Science* **353**, 72-74,
440 doi:10.1126/science.aaf4610 (2016).
- 441 12 Leuzinger, S. & Körner, C. Rainfall distribution is the main driver of runoff under
442 future CO₂-concentration in a temperate deciduous forest. *Global Change Biol.* **16**,
443 246-254, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2009.01937.x (2010).
- 444 13 Reich, P. B., Hobbie, S. E. & Lee, T. D. Plant growth enhancement by elevated CO₂
445 eliminated by joint water and nitrogen limitation. *Nature Geoscience* **7**, 920-924,
446 doi:10.1038/ngeo2284 (2014).
- 447 14 Gray, S. B. *et al.* Intensifying drought eliminates the expected benefits of elevated
448 carbon dioxide for soybean. *Nature Plants* **2**, 16132, doi:10.1038/nplants.2016.132
449 (2016).
- 450 15 Hovenden, M. J., Newton, P. C. D. & Wills, K. E. Seasonal not annual rainfall
451 determines grassland biomass response to carbon dioxide. *Nature* **511**, 583-586,
452 doi:10.1038/nature13281 (2014).
- 453 16 Morgan, J. A. *et al.* C₄ grasses prosper as carbon dioxide eliminates desiccation in
454 warmed semi-arid grassland. *Nature* **476**, 202-205, doi:10.1038/nature10274 (2011).

- 455 17 Langley, J. A. & Megonigal, J. P. Ecosystem response to elevated CO₂ levels limited
456 by nitrogen-induced plant species shift. *Nature* **466**, 96-99, doi:10.1038/nature09176
457 (2010).
- 458 18 Reich, P. B. & Hobbie, S. E. Decade-long soil nitrogen constraint on the CO₂
459 fertilization of plant biomass. *Nature Climate Change* **3**, 278-282,
460 doi:10.1038/nclimate1694 (2013).
- 461 19 Lüscher, A., Daepf, M., Blum, H., Hartwig, U. A. & Nösberger, J. Fertile temperate
462 grassland under elevated atmospheric CO₂—role of feed-back mechanisms and
463 availability of growth resources. *European Journal of Agronomy* **21**, 379-398,
464 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eja.2003.10.009> (2004).
- 465 20 Darenova, E., Holub, P., Krupkova, L. & Pavelka, M. Effect of repeated spring
466 drought and summer heavy rain on managed grassland biomass production and CO₂
467 efflux. *Journal of Plant Ecology* **10**, 476-485, doi:10.1093/jpe/rtw058 (2017).
- 468 21 Bates, J. D., Svejcar, T., Miller, R. F. & Angell, R. A. The effects of precipitation
469 timing on sagebrush steppe vegetation. *J. Arid Environ.* **64**, 670-697,
470 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaridenv.2005.06.026> (2006).
- 471 22 Smart, A. J., Dunn, B. H., Johnson, P. S., Xu, L. & Gates, R. N. Using Weather Data
472 to Explain Herbage Yield on Three Great Plains Plant Communities. *Rangeland Ecol.*
473 *Manage.* **60**, 146-153, doi:10.2111/05-099R4.1 (2007).
- 474 23 Epstein, H. E., Burke, I. C. & Lauenroth, W. K. Response of the Shortgrass Steppe to
475 Changes in Rainfall Seasonality. *Ecosystems* **2**, 139-150, doi:10.1007/s100219900065
476 (1999).
- 477 24 Reich, P. B. *et al.* Species and functional group diversity independently influence
478 biomass accumulation and its response to CO₂ and N. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*
479 **101**, 10101-10106 (2004).
- 480 25 Lüscher, A., Hendrey, G. R. & Nösberger, J. Long-term responsiveness to free air
481 CO₂ enrichment of functional types, species and genotypes of plants from fertile
482 permanent grassland. *Oecologia* **113**, 37-45 (1998).
- 483 26 Wilcox, K. R., Blair, J. M., Smith, M. D. & Knapp, A. K. Does ecosystem sensitivity
484 to precipitation at the site-level conform to regional-scale predictions? *Ecology* **97**,
485 561-568, doi:10.1890/15-1437.1 (2016).
- 486 27 Averill, C., Waring, B. G. & Hawkes, C. V. Historical precipitation predictably alters
487 the shape and magnitude of microbial functional response to soil moisture. *Global*
488 *Change Biol.* **22**, 1957-1964, doi:10.1111/gcb.13219 (2016).
- 489 28 Tredennick, A. T., Kleinhesselink, A. R., Taylor, J. B. & Adler, P. B. Ecosystem
490 functional response across precipitation extremes in a sagebrush steppe. *PeerJ* **6**,
491 e4485, doi:10.7717/peerj.4485 (2018).
- 492 29 Luo, Y. *et al.* Progressive nitrogen limitation of ecosystem responses to rising
493 atmospheric carbon dioxide. *Bioscience* **54**, 731-739 (2004).
- 494 30 Cable, J. M. *et al.* Antecedent Conditions Influence Soil Respiration Differences in
495 Shrub and Grass Patches. *Ecosystems* **16**, 1230-1247, doi:10.1007/s10021-013-9679-7
496 (2013).
- 497 31 Ogle, K. *et al.* Quantifying ecological memory in plant and ecosystem processes.
498 *Ecol. Lett.* **18**, 221-235, doi:10.1111/ele.12399 (2015).
- 499 32 Peltier, D. M. P., Fell, M. & Ogle, K. Legacy effects of drought in the southwestern
500 United States: A multi-species synthesis. *Ecol. Monogr.* **86**, 312-326,
501 doi:10.1002/ecm.1219/supinfo (2016).
- 502 33 Reynolds, J. F., Kemp, P. R., Ogle, K. & Fernandez, R. J. Modifying the 'pulse-
503 reserve' paradigm for deserts of North America: precipitation pulses, soil water, and
504 plant responses. *Oecologia* **141**, 194-210, doi:10.1007/s00442-004-1524-4 (2004).

505 34 Knapp, A. K. & Smith, M. D. Variation among biomes in temporal dynamics of
506 aboveground primary production. *Science* **291**, 481-484,
507 doi:10.1126/science.291.5503.481 (2001).

508 35 Sala, O. E., Parton, W. J., Joyce, L. A. & Lauenroth, W. K. Primary production of the
509 central grassland region of the United States. *Ecology* **69**, 40-45,
510 doi:10.2307/1943158 (1988).

511 36 IPCC. 151 (IPCC, Geneva, Switzerland, 2014).

512 37 R: A language and environment for statistical computing (R Foundation for Statistical
513 Computing, Vienna, Austria., Vienna, Austria, 2018).

514 38 MuMIn: Multi-Model Inference. R package version 1.15.6 (2016).

515 39 Logan, M. *Biostatistical Design and Analysis Using R: A practical guide*. (Wiley-
516 Blackwell, 2010).

517 40 Harrell, F. E. *Regression modeling strategies: with applications to linear models,*
518 *logistic regression and survival analysis*. (Springer 2001).

519 41 Fox, J. Effect Displays in R for Generalised Linear Models. *Journal of Statistical*
520 *Software* **8**, 1-27 (2003).

521 42 Venables, W. N. & Ripley, B. D. *Modern Applied Statistics with S*. 4th edn,
522 (Springer, 2002).

523 43 Hansen, M., DeFries, R., Townshend, J. R. G. & Sohlberg, R. Global land cover
524 classification at 1 km resolution using a decision tree classifier. *Int. J. Remote Sens.*
525 **21**, 1331-1365 (2000).

526 44 Larsen, K. S. *et al.* Reduced N cycling in response to elevated CO₂, warming, and
527 drought in a Danish heathland: Synthesizing results of the CLIMAITE project after
528 two years of treatments. *Global Change Biol.* **17**, 1884-1899, doi:10.1111/j.1365-
529 2486.2010.02351.x (2011).

530 45 Kongstad, J. *et al.* High Resilience in Heathland Plants to Changes in Temperature,
531 Drought, and CO₂ in Combination: Results from the CLIMAITE Experiment.
532 *Ecosystems* **15**, 269-283, doi:10.1007/s10021-011-9508-9 (2012).

533 46 Winkler, J. B. & Herbst, M. Do plants of a semi-natural grassland community benefit
534 from long-term CO₂ enrichment? *Basic Appl. Ecol.* **5**, 131-143 (2004).

535 47 Andresen, L. C. *et al.* Biomass responses in a temperate European grassland through
536 17 years of elevated CO₂. *Glob Chang Biol*, doi:10.1111/gcb.13705 (2017).

537 48 Nagy, Z. & Tuba, Z. Effects of elevated air CO₂ concentration on loess grassland
538 vegetation as investigated in a mini FACE experiment. *Community Ecology* **9**, 153-
539 160 (2008).

540 49 Byrne, C. & Jones, M. B. Effects of elevated CO₂ and nitrogen fertiliser on biomass,
541 productivity, community structure and species diversity of a semi-natural grassland in
542 Ireland. *Biology and Environment: Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* **102B**,
543 141-150 (2002).

544 50 Zhu, K., Chiariello, N. R., Tobeck, T., Fukami, T. & Field, C. B. Nonlinear,
545 interacting responses to climate limit grassland production under global change. *Proc.*
546 *Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **113**, 10589-10594, doi:10.1073/pnas.1606734113 (2016).

547 51 Field, C. B., Chapin III, F. S., Chiariello, N. R., Holland, E. A. & Mooney, H. A. in
548 *Carbon Dioxide and Terrestrial Ecosystems* (eds G. W. Koch & H. A. Mooney) Ch.
549 **8**, 121-145 (Academic Press, 1996).

550 52 Owensby, C. E., Coyne, P., Ham, J., Auen, L. & Knapp, A. Biomass production in a
551 tallgrass prairie ecosystem exposed to ambient and elevated CO₂. *Ecol. Appl.* **3**, 644-
552 653 (1993).

553 53 Li, Y., Newton, P. C. D. & Lieffering, M. Testing simulations of intra- and inter-
554 annual variation in the plant production response to elevated CO₂ against

555 measurements from an 11-year FACE experiment on grazed pasture. *Global Change*
 556 *Biol.* **20**, 228-239 (2014).
 557 54 Kardol, P. *et al.* Climate change effects on plant biomass alter dominance patterns and
 558 community evenness in an experimental old-field ecosystem. *Global Change Biol.* **16**,
 559 2676-2687, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2010.02162.x (2010).
 560 55 Morgan, J. A. *et al.* CO₂ enhances productivity, alters species composition, and
 561 reduces digestibility of shortgrass steppe vegetation. *Ecol. Appl.* **14**, 208-219 (2004).
 562 56 Drake, B. G. Rising sea level, temperature, and precipitation impact plant and
 563 ecosystem responses to elevated CO₂ on a Chesapeake Bay wetland: review of a 28-
 564 year study. *Global Change Biol.* **20**, 3329-3343, doi:10.1111/gcb.12631 (2014).
 565 57 Schneider, M. K. *et al.* Ten years of free-air CO₂ enrichment altered the mobilization
 566 of N from soil in *Lolium perenne* L. swards. *Global Change Biol.* **10**, 1377-1388,
 567 doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2004.00803.x (2004).
 568 58 Zanetti, S., Hartwig, UA., van Kessel, C., Lüscher, A., Hebeisen, T., Frehner, M.,
 569 Fischer, BU., Blum, HH., Nösberger, J. Does nitrogen nutrition restrict the CO₂
 570 response of fertile grassland lacking legumes? *Oecologia* **112**, 17-25 (1997).
 571
 572
 573

Acknowledgments

We thank Rose Brinkhoff for assistance with collating the data for this analysis. This research was initiated at a workshop on “Using results from global change experiments to inform land model development and calibration” co-sponsored by the US-based INTERFACE Research Coordination Network and the Research Group of Global Change Ecology at Henan University (funded by MOST2013CB956300 and NSFC41030104/ D0308).

Author contributions

S.L., J.A.L., M.J.H. and S.F. conceived the research idea and designed the study with assistance from P.C.D.N. and K.H., while M.J.H., S.L., P.C.D.N., J.A.L. and S.F. did the analysis and together with A.L. and P.B.R. led the writing of the manuscript. A.F. did the mapping and all geographical analyses. P.C.D.N., M.J.H., J.A.L., L.C.A., D.B., N.R.C., J.D., J.K., A.L., P.N., C.B., P.B.R., S.W. and J.S. contributed unpublished data. All authors contributed to the final version of the manuscript.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests

Additional information

Supplementary information is available for this paper at...

Reprints and permissions information is available at www.nature.com/reprints.

Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to M.J.H.

Figure legends

Fig. 1. The impact of seasonal precipitation on the CO₂-fertilisation effect (CFE). Partial regression plots showing the influence on the CO₂ fertilisation effect attributable to spring and non-spring precipitation across nineteen grassland elevated CO₂ experiments. The black line shows the modelled effect with 95% confidence bands shown in red.

Fig. 2. The carbon dioxide fertilisation effect (CFE) across nineteen temperate grassland experiments as a function of different potential drivers. Each point is the mean percentage stimulation of aboveground annual biomass production by elevated CO₂, the CO₂ fertilisation effect (CFE), for a particular site. Relationships between each driver and the CFE were analysed by simple regression, with associated r^2 and P values shown in each panel, n=19 independent experiments. Abbreviations: MAP, mean annual precipitation, MAT, mean annual temperature, Shoot N, the mean nitrogen content of aboveground biomass in control plots; Proportion C₄, the mean proportion of biomass contributed by C₄ species, Enrichment, the mean CO₂ enrichment level, AG Biomass, the mean aboveground biomass of control plots.

Fig. 3. Predicted CFE of aboveground biomass for given spring and non-spring precipitation values. Predictions used the formula $CFE (\%) = 2.94 + 0.135 \text{ spring precipitation (mm)} - 0.035 \text{ non-spring precipitation (mm)}$. The CFE is for a CO₂ enrichment of 243 $\mu\text{mol mol}^{-1}$ above an ambient [CO₂] of 375 $\mu\text{mol mol}^{-1}$. Suppression of biomass is shown as red, stimulation of biomass shown in blue. Contours show the probability density of particular combinations of spring and non-spring precipitation for temperate grasslands worldwide, most of which lie within a range in which CFE is predicted to be low. The

nineteen experiments used in this analysis are plotted to show their combination of spring and non-spring precipitation values, details provided in Table S1.

Fig. 4. Modelled CO₂ fertilisation effect (CFE) in temperate grasslands. **A**, Modelled CFE for temperate grassland, using the formula $CFE (\%) = 2.94 + 0.135 \text{ spring precipitation (mm)} - 0.035 \text{ non-spring precipitation (mm)}$, for a CO₂ enrichment of 243 $\mu\text{mol mol}^{-1}$ above an ambient [CO₂] of 375 $\mu\text{mol mol}^{-1}$. Grey areas fall outside the precipitation limits of this analysis. White areas are not temperate zones or not grasslands. **B**, Frequency distribution of modelled CFE in temperate grassland sites within the precipitation range used to construct the model. **C**, Frequency distributions of modelled CFE as for (b) for Europe, Asia, North America and the Southern Hemisphere. Mean CFE (\pm SEM) for each region is 5.9 \pm 0.03% (Europe, n=14,604 grid-squares), 4.1 \pm 0.05 (Asia, n=24,944 grid-squares), 8.9 \pm 0.05% (North America, n=13,764 grid-squares) and 7.5 \pm 0.05% (Southern Hemisphere, n=9,027 grid-squares).







